| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assam | 17 | 3 | Assam | 23 | 4 |
| Bihar | 46 | 15 | Bihar | 55 | 28 |
| Chhattisgarh | 55 | 24 | Chhattisgarh | 44 | 20 |
| Gujarat | 21 | 5 | Gujarat | 16 | 3 |
| Haryana | 7 | 1 | Haryana | 22 | 7 |
| Jharkhand | 46 | 15 | Jharkhand | 33 | 14 |
| Karnataka | 32 | 7 | Karnataka | 31 | 12 |
| Kerala | 7 | 2 | Kerala | 22 | 7 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 47 | 21 | Madhya Pradesh | 43 | 18 |
| Maharashtra | 30 | 11 | Maharashtra | 25 | 8 |
| Orissa | 57 | 31 | Orissa | 50 | 25 |
| Punjab | 4 | 1 | Punjab | 18 | 1 |
| Rajasthan | 17 | 3 | Rajasthan | 36 | 10 |
| Tamil Nadu | 26 | 6 | Tamil Nadu | 26 | 7 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 33 | 10 | Uttar Pradesh | 44 | 17 |
| West Bengal | 24 | 5 | West Bengal | 29 | 8 |
| ALL-INDIA: | 30 | 10 | ALL-INDIA: | 30 | 10 |

**Confusing parameters for census of BPL**

†*318. SHRI PYARELAL KHANDELWAL: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that parameters for census of people living below poverty line vary, causing confusion;

(b) whether it is also a fact that problem has become more serious due to non-uniformity in the parameters of Central Government and State Governments;

(c) whether Government are considering to set up a task force in this regard; and

(d) if not, the State-wise number of poor persons and the details of the parameters adopted for their identification?

THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI RAGHUVANSH PRASAD SINGH): (a) to (d) The Ministry of Rural Development conducts the BPL Census generally in the beginning of the Five Year Plan to identify the rural households living Below the Poverty Line who could be assisted under its various programmes. The BPL Census was conducted earlier in 1992 for the Eighth Five Year Plan and in 1997 for the Ninth Five Year Plan using the income and expenditure criteria respectively. For the Tenth Five Year Plan, BPL Census 2002 has been conducted using the uniform methodology of 'Score Based Ranking' of the rural households

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

for which 13 socio-economic parameters have been used. This methodology was recommended by the Expert Group constituted by the Ministry and was adopted after a wide range of discussions with different stakeholders including the State Governments which is considered to be an improvement over the methodologies based on income and expenditure approach used for the previous BPL Censuses. However, some of the States like Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and West Bengal have conducted more comprehensive surveys to meet their own State specific requirements of statistics, but it has been promised to furnish the BPL list to this Ministry on the basis of prescribed methodology.

The results of BPL Census 2002 could not be finalized as was stipulated originally because of the stay order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 5.5.2003 during the hearing of a Writ Petition No.196 of 2001 in the matter of PUCL *Vs.* Union of India. The stay was vacated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 14.2.2006. Immediately after vacation of the stay, the State Governments were advised to finalise the BPL list in a transparent manner by taking the measures of giving wide publicity, to get the approval of the Gram Sabha, displaying the list at the Panchayat Headquarters, to keep the printed copies in the booklet form at the Panchayat Headquarters and paint the list of BPL households on the wall of the Panchayat Building in the ascending order along with posting it on the website. A two-stage appeal mechanism was also introduced to redress the public grievances. The State Governments are reported to have received a large number of objections which took considerable time to resolve them. A number of States are still in the process of finalizing the BPL list and there is no proposal at present to set up any Task Force.

Under the guidelines of BPL Census 2002, the States were given the option to identify the number of BPL households in the rural areas in such a way that it should be equal to the poverty estimates of 1999-2000 or the Adjusted Share worked out by the Planning Commission, whichever is higher. Another 10% flexibility was allowed to account for the transient poor. The number of BPL households on the basis of Adjusted Share and poverty estimates of 1999-2000 is at Statement-I (*See* below). A Statement indicating the list of States who have finalized the BPL list on the basis of BPL Census 2002 along with the total number of rural BPL households identified is at Statement-II (*See* below). The list of parameters prescribed for BPL Census 2002 is at Statement-III.

***Statement-I***

*Details regarding rural BPL families as per Adjusted Share and poverty estimates of* 1999-2000

(Families in lakhs)

| Sl. No. | States | No. of BPL families as per Adjusted Share | No. of BPL families as per 1999-2000, poverty estimates |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. | Andhra Pradesh | 27.526 | 11.626 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | Arunachal Pradesh | 0.605 | 0.760 |
| 3. | Assam | 15.725 | 18.434 |
| 4. | Bihar | 66.322 | 55.380 |
| 5. | Chhattisgarh | 15.019 | 14.802 |
| 6. | Goa | 0.063 | 0.022 |
| 7. | Gujarat | 10.361 | 7.960 |
| 8. | Haryana | 6.096 | 2.388 |
| 9. | Himachal Pradesh | 2.567 | 0.968 |
| 10. | Jammu and Kashmir | 3.177 | 0.594 |
| 11. | Jharkhand | 23.851 | 19.922 |
| 12. | Karnataka | 20.786 | 11.982 |
| 13. | Kerala | 9.327 | 4.194 |
| 14. | Madhya Pradesh | 30.687 | 28.762 |
| 15. | Maharashtra | 41.089 | 25.024 |
| 16. | Manipur | 1.054 | 1.306 |
| 17. | Meghalaya | 1.181 | 1.578 |
| 18. | Mizoram | 0.273 | 0.280 |
| 19. | Nagaland | 0.810 | 1.042 |
| 20. | Orissa | 31.484 | 28.738 |
| 21. | Punjab | 2.962 | 2.040 |
| 22. | Rajasthan | 15.784 | 11.012 |
| 23. | Sikkim | 0.303 | 0.400 |
| 24. | Tamil Nadu | 24.339 | 16.102 |
| 25. | Tripura | 1.903 | 2.506 |
| 26. | Uttaranchal | 5.468 | 4.566 |
| 27. | Uttar Pradesh | 93.768 | 77.836 |
| 28. | West Bengal | 34.989 | 36.022 |
| 29. | A and N Islands | 0.146 | 0.116 |
| 30. | Delhi | 0.039 | 0.014 |
| 31. | Chandigarh | 0.015 | 0.012 |
| 32. | D and N Haveli | 0.146 | 0.060 |
| 33. | Daman and Diu | 0.005 | 0.002 |
| 34. | Lakshadweep | 0.010 | 0.006 |
| 35. | Pondicherry | 0.185 | 0.128 |
| | ALL INDIA: | 488.056 | 386.584 |

***Statement-II***

*States where BPL list has finalised on the basis of BPL Census, 2002*

| Sl. No. | State/UT | No. of BPL Rural Families as per 2002 Census |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Arunachal Pradesh | 83007 |
| 2. | Chhattisgarh | 1789237 |
| 3. | Goa | 7054 |
| 4. | Gujarat | 1451215 |
| 5. | Himachal Pradesh | 282370 |
| 6. | Jharkhand | 2481029 |
| 7. | Karnataka | 1919014 |
| 8 | Madhya Pradesh | 4084211 |
| 9. | Maharashtra | 4502516 |
| 10. | Mizoram | 37384 |
| 11. | Nagaland | 155837 |
| 12. | Punjab | 324637 |
| 13. | Rajasthan | 1736200 |
| 14. | Uttar Pradesh | 10027136 |
| 15. | Uttarakhand | 623790 |
| 16. | A and N Islands | 10692* |
| 17. | Daman and Diu | 535 |

*Only for Andaman

***Statement-III***

*List of* 13 *Socio-Economic Indicators for identification of rural BPL households (BPL Census* 2002*-each parameter carries score* 0-4*)*

| Sl. No. | Indicators |
|---|---|
| 1 | 2 |
| 1 | **Land Holdings (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Nil holdings |
| (ii) | Less than one ha unirrigated or 0.5 ha irrigated |
| (iii) | More than one and less than 2 ha unirrigated or 0.5 to 1 ha irrigated |
| (iv) | More than 2 ha and less than 5 ha unirrigated or 1.0-2.5 irrigated |
| (v) | More than 5 ha unirrigated or more than 2.5 ha irrigated |

| 1 | 2 |
|---|---|
| 2 | **Type of House (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Houseless |
| (ii) | Kutcha |
| (iii) | Semi Pucca |
| (iv) | Pucca |
| (v) | Urban type |
| 3 | **Availability of Clothing (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Less than two pairs |
| (ii) | More than two pairs but less than four |
| (iii) | More than four pairs but less than six |
| (iv) | More than six pairs but less than ten |
| (v) | More than ten pairs |
| 4 | **Food Security (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Less than one meal per day in major part of the year |
| (ii) | Normal one meal but sometimes less |
| (iii) | Normal one meal throughout the year |
| (iv) | Two meals per day and occasional shortage |
| (v) | Enough food |
| 5 | **Sanitation (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Open defecation |
| (ii) | Group latrines with irregular water supply |
| (iii) | Group latrines with regular water supply |
| (iv) | Group latrine with irregular water supply and sweeper |
| (v) | Private latrine |
| 6 | **Ownership of consumer durables *viz.* TV, Electric Fan, Kitchen appliances, Cooker, Radio etc. (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Nil |
| (ii) | Anyone item |
| (iii) | Two items only |
| (iv) | Any three |
| (v) | All items |

| 1 | 2 |
|---|---|
| 7 | **Literacy status of highest literate (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Illiterate |
| (ii) | Upto primary |
| (iii) | Completed secondary/passed 10th |
| (iv) | Graduate/Professional |
| (v) | Post Graduate/Professional |
| 8 | **Status of Household Labour (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Bonded labour |
| (ii) | Women and Child labour |
| (iii) | Only adult female and no child labour |
| (iv) | Adult males only |
| (v) | Others |
| 9 | **Means of livelihood (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Casual labour |
| (ii) | Subsistence cultivation |
| (iii) | Artisan |
| (iv) | Salary |
| (v) | Others |
| 10 | **Status of Children (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Not going to school and working |
| (ii) | Going to school and working |
| (iii) | Nil |
| (iv) | Nil |
| (v) | Going to school and not working |
| 11 | **Type of Indebtedness (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Daily consumption purposes from normal source |
| (ii) | For production purposes from normal source |
| (iii) | For other purposes from normal source |

| 1 | 2 |
|---|---|
| (iv) | Borrowing from institutional agencies |
| (v) | No indebtedness and possess assets |
| 12 | **Reason for migration (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Casual work |
| (ii) | Seasonal employment |
| (iii) | Other forms of livelihood |
| (iv) | Non-migrant |
| (v) | Other purposes |
| 13 | **Preference for Assistance (tick ✓ one and indicate score)** |
| (i) | Wage employment |
| (ii) | Self-employment |
| (iii) | Training and skill upgradation |
| (iv) | Housing |
| (v) | Loan/Subsidy more than Rs. One lakh or no assistance required |

**Impact of liberalized import**

*319. SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: Will the Minister of COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have conducted any study to assess the impact of liberalized import under various regional and bilateral trade agreements, of agricultural products on Indian agriculture; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and the protection given to Indian farmers?

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI KAMAL NATH): (a) and (b) Before entering into any negotiation for a bilateral or regional Free Trade Agreement, studies are undertaken internally, as well as through joint study groups to examine the feasibility of the proposed agreement, including its impact on the domestic agriculture and industrial sectors. Typically, the Free Trade Agreements protect sensitive products of the two sides through the inclusion of negative lists as well as a safeguards mechanism to protect against possible surges in imports. The Government, in close consultation with the concerned Ministries, decides on the agricultural products that need to be included in the negative list of a particular agreement, where no tariff concessions are to be offered. A reduction in customs duties is offered in respect of certain agricultural products only after taking into account the sensitivities of our agricultural sector and the potential volume of trade in these products.